

OCT. 22. 2004 1:08PM

KODA & ANDROLIA

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**OCT 22 2004**

NO. 965 P. 1/4

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

211A 3123

In re application of:

KAZUYUKI SAKAMAKI

Serial No: 09/870,279

Filed: May 30, 2001

For: GEAR MADE OF RESIN, IMAGE-  
FORMING DEVICE, AND  
ROTATION-TRANSMITTING  
MEANS MADE OF RESIN

Art Unit: 3682

Examiner: Timothy P. McAnulty

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action dated June 25, 2004, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider the following remarks and reconsider the finality of the rejection.

submits that the Examiner is selecting the web 4 between the second annular rib 5 and the portion 3a of the teeth 3 utilizing the hindsight provided by Applicant's application and not based upon any teaching contained in JP '124 or any other art cited.

Applicant has carefully reviewed Williams et al. and Applicant respectfully submits that in Williams et al. the corrugated web extends from the inner shaft support 2 to the teeth as one continuous piece without any annular ribs in between at all. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Williams et al. that the corrugations would be utilized in a gear with additional annular ribs and particularly that one would only utilize the corrugated web in the web located between the outermost annular rib and the teeth. Applicant further respectfully submits that the only way one would make this selection would be to utilize the hindsight provided by Applicant's invention and this is not proper.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that not only is the combination suggested by the Examiner not Applicant's invention but also the combination suggested by the Examiner is not suggested by the art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 3-6 are not obvious over JP '124 in view of Williams et al.

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over JP '124 in view of Williams et al. and further in view of Mlenjnek et al., stating that the combination of Williams et al. and JP '124 discloses the basic apparatus but does not disclose that the plastic gear is used to drive an image forming device; Mlenjnek et al. teaches a laser printer drive train utilizing a drive means 31, 32 having a plastic gear 18; and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the combination of JP '124 and Williams et al. in an image forming device as taught by Mlenjnek et al.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to incorporate by reference his comments above concerning JP '124 and Williams et al. In addition, Applicant's review of Mlenjnek et al. indicates that while it discloses a laser printer drive train, it too does not show or suggest anything concerning the actual construction of the plastic gear 18 and/or the particular construction of the plastic gear which would require the corrugation to be provided between the outermost annular rib and the gear teeth.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that not only is the combination suggested by the Examiner not Applicant's invention but also the combination suggested by the Examiner is not suggested by the art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits